



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,365	05/26/2000	Stephen Dao Hui Hsu	004828.P001	8126

7590 10/04/2003

Dennis M De Guzman
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,365

Applicant(s)

HSU ET AL.

Examiner

Tongoc Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2134

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' application serial no.

09/580,360 filed on 5/26/2000.

Specification

2. This application does not contain a Brief Summary of the Invention as required by 37 CFR 1.73.

Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900) in view of Munger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 B1).

Art Unit: 2134

5. In respect to claims 1, 10, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34 and 36, Subramaniam discloses a method, a machine readable medium, an apparatus, and a system, comprising:

“responsive to a request, retrieving a web page designated in the request” (see 6, lines 61-65);

“modifying an address associated with the retrieved web page to indicate an address associated with a secure server that retrieve the web page” (see col. 7, lines 1-20);

“providing an intermediate unit to receive a request for a web page from a terminal; and at a secure server, receiving the request, forward from the intermediate unit” (see col. 6, lines 40-64);

“retrieving the web page designated in the request from a source” (see col. 9, lines 18-30);

sending retrieved web page via a secure link, to a terminal that sent the request (see col. 6, lines 40-51). However, Subramaniam does not disclose encrypting data associated with the retrieved web page before sending. Munger, on the other hand, discloses encrypting an IP packets consisting of messages with a constant IP destination address before sending (see col. 13, lines 45-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the encryption teaching of Munger in sending IP packet in order to provide a more secure data transmission over the network.

Art Unit: 2134

6. In respect to claims 2, 21, 29, 32, and 35, Subramaniam further discloses "the secure link comprises a secure sockets layer (SSL) link". (see col. 3, lines 20-25).

7. In respect to claims 3 and 22, Subramaniam further discloses "modifying the address associated with the retrieved web page comprises modifying a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or Internet Protocol (IP) address of a source web site that originated the web page" (see col. 3, lines 17-18 and col. 7, lines 1-20).

8. In respect to claim 4, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1 further disclose "modifying the address with the retrieved web page comprises modifying an address associated with a hypertext link in the retrieved web page to indicate the address associated with the secure server" (see col. 7, lines 1-20).

9. In respect to claim 5, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further disclose "modifying computer code associated with the retrieved web page to cause subsequent requests related to the retrieved web page to be sent to the secure server instead of to a source web site that originated the web page" (see col. 19, lines 48-56).

10. In respect to claim 6, 19 and 27, Subramaniam further disclose redirect the address associate with the web page from an address received along with the request from the terminal, the address received along with the request from the terminal comprising concatenation of the address associated with the web page and the address associated with the secure server" (see col. 6, lines 40-

Art Unit: 2134

60). Subramaniam does not disclose decrypting the address of the web page received along with the request. However, Munger discloses encrypting and decrypting a packet that consist of messages with constant IP destination address (see col. 13, line 46-52 and col. 14, lines 14-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of encrypting and decrypting address taught by Munger in order to provide a more secure data transmission over the network.

11. In respect to claim 7, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "repeating the retrieving, modifying, and sending while the secure link is active" (see col. 6, line 60-col. 7, line 20).

In respect to claim 9, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "at the secure server, controlling transmission of electronic files to the terminal based on preferences received from the terminal" (see col. 6, lines 40-60).

12. In respect to claim 11, 17, 25 and 33, Subramaniam further discloses "receiving subsequent requests from the terminal at the intermediate unit rather than directly at the secure server from the terminal" (see col. 8, lines 24-30).

In respect to claim 12 and 18, Subramaniam further discloses "receiving subsequent requests from the terminal at the intermediate unit rather than directly at the secure server from the terminal" (see col. 8, lines 24-30).

In respect to claim 13 and 30, Subramaniam further discloses "storing under a pseudonym at a location communicatively couple to the secure server, electronic

Art Unit: 2134

files sent from a web site along with the web pages" (see Fig. 1, item 110, col. 9, lines 32-47, col. 10, line 10-15).

13. In respect to claim 14, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "obtaining information related to a user's communication with the secure server" (see col. 8, lines 40-46).

In respect to claim 15, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam further discloses "providing a viewing window at the terminal; displaying the retrieved web page at the viewing window; and providing an interface for subsequent communication with the secure server from the viewing window" (see col. 9, lines 32-40).

14. In respect to claim 26, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the machine-readable medium of claim 24. Subramaniam further discloses:

"receive subsequent requests from directly the terminal rather than directly at the secure server" (see col. 9, lines 18-20).

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900) and Munger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,135 B1) in view of Gampper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,106).

In respect to claim 8, Subramaniam and Munger disclose the method of claim 1. Subramaniam and Munger do not disclose "triggering a deletion of stored electronic files at the terminal related to a communication via the secure link, in response to termination of the communication". However, Gampper discloses continuously delete files in a local cache in order to make room for more recent

Art Unit: 2134

retrieved web pages (see col. 64-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the continuously deletion of storage to make room for more recent retrieved web pages as taught by Gampper.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Skopp et al. discloses a method and apparatus to determine user identity and limit access to a communications network.

-Micali discloses simulateous electronic transactions with visable trusted parties.

-Srinivasan discloses a pay per record system and method.

-Green et al. disclose a secure network proxy for connecting entities.

-Hartoli et al. Disclose a method and apparatus for billing for transactions conducted over the Internet.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9600.

Examiner Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT
September 25, 2003

Matthew D. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2134